

**REMARKS**

The 11 March 2005 official action addressed claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-23 and 25-29. Claims 1, 12 and 21 are amended and claims 10, 19 and 28 are canceled.

**Overview of amendments**

The independent claims are amended to incorporate the features of dependent claims specifying that user input is received that specifies the amount of time in advance of a programming event that an alert for that programming event is to be provided to the viewer.

The dependent claims formerly reciting those features are canceled.

No new matter is added.

**Response to objections and rejections**

Claims 10, 19 and 28 were rejected as being obvious over Eick (U.S. 5,912,664) in view of Lee (U.S. 6,463,428). Independent claims 1, 12 and 21 have been amended to incorporate the features of claims 10, 19 and 28, respectively, and reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

The claims generally describe a process of creating a viewer profile that is used to determine programming events of interest to a viewer. Each independent claim now specifies the receipt of input from a user specifying an amount of time prior to a programming event determined to be of interest using said viewer profile that an alert for that programming event is to be provided to the viewer. In other words, the user provides input specifying that alerts should be provided five minutes prior to those programming events, or fifteen minutes, or one minute, as the user chooses.

The official action cited Lee as teaching this feature, referring to col. 3, lines 23-48, and particularly lines 31-34. The cited portion of Lee states that alerts may be provided for programs that are automatically selected by Lee's

device, but there is no disclosure that the user has any control over the timing of those alerts. Lee merely says that "MbTV can help viewers schedule their television watching time by alerting them to desirable upcoming programs..." (col 3, lines 31-32). The rest of the cited portion does not discuss alerts.

Lee does not teach that the user can tell the device how far in advance of a program to provide an alert. Rather, Lee describes an automated system with no apparent user control over alert timing, and no user input that specifies the amount of time prior to a programming event to provide an alert. There is no suggestion to provide such user control or input. As such the cited combination of references lack this feature required by every claim of the application and do not render the claims obvious.

In view of these differences, allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 12, 2005  
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number 23392  
Telephone: (310) 277-2223  
Facsimile: (310) 557-8475

By *Paul S. Lyle* Reg. No. 56,252  
for  
Ronald Coslick  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 36,489